

Message

---

**From:** Subramaniam, Ravi [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=E738F9D27062486E9047184B867FD968-SUBRAMANIAM, RAVI]  
**Sent:** 8/19/2014 3:56:20 PM  
**To:** Bussard, David [bussard.david@epa.gov]; Jinot, Jennifer [jinot.jennifer@epa.gov]; chaochen25@comcast.net; Kenny Crump [KennyCrump@email.com]  
**Subject:** revised bottom up letter  
**Attachments:** Bottom up letter-NCEA 08-19-14 JJV RS3 DB2 (3) KSC CC.docx

Sorry for the delay in responding. Got caught in two significant deadlines after returning from vacation.

I worked off the latest version in the email exchanges, sent by David 8-4 titled ...7-22-14 JJV RS2 DB2 (3) CC, and found that this did not have Kenny's edits incorporated in David's email of 8-1 titled ... JJV RS2 DB2 (3) KSC. Those versions appear to have crossed. So my edits include reinstating those edits from Kenny.

Second, I see Chao did not like the sentence, "They might overcome this underestimation, but from the procedure per se one would not know when that would, or would not, be the case." I see that David has responded to Chao on this matter but it does not appear to have been resolved. I am leaving the sentence as is. However, I note that the word "necessarily" in the previous sentence covers this point: "The authors of the bottom-up approach have not provided a basis to conclude that using the lower confidence limit on C0 or other conservative assumptions will necessarily overcome any underestimation by the bottom-up approach of the slope at C0. I am therefore not averse to deleting this sentence, but don't have a problem leaving it in either.

I made a couple of other very minor edits.

I am fine with the revised figure.

I believe Jennifer needs to look at this yet.

Ravi.

---

Ravi Subramaniam, PhD; Associate, Quantitative Methods Branch, IRIS Division, NCEA-ORD, US EPA  
(703) 347-8606 (Tu, W, Th); (301) 515-2701 (M, F)

---